

REMARKS

The Office Action dated July 10, 2003 has been read and carefully considered and the present amendment submitted to make certain clarification to the claim language.

Claims 9-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pajerski *et al*, U.S. Patent 4,697,661 in view of Hecker *et al*, U.S. Patent 3,986,090. Accordingly, claim 9 has been amended to better define the present invention over the combination of those references.

With respect to the Examiner's comments at the bottom of page 4 of the Office Action which referred to page 7, lines 23-26 of the Remarks section of Applicant's amendment filed May 20, 2003, it is submitted that there is difference between the measured magnitudes in Hecker *et al*. and in the present invention.

It is noted that the language preamble of claim 9 specifically recites:

"the sensor means:

detecting a mechanical force of pushing and pulling applied to the push and pull elements by a user;

transforming said mechanical force into electric signals indicating degree and direction of the mechanical force;"

where there is in fact stated to be a conversion from a mechanical magnitude to an electric magnitude. However, the later, characterizing portion of claim 9 recites:

"each power amplifier is provided with a feedback circuit for comparing, by means of a comparator means, a true value of an electric current fed to the electric motor with a pre-established nominal value of an electric current needed to achieve movement..."

Thus, it appears that in the part for controlling the functioning of the motor (feedback), which forms the characterizing portion of claim 9, an electric magnitude (current) is measured in the present invention, while a mechanical magnitude (motor running speed) is measured in the cited reference.

Whereas the preamble of claim 9 does not exclude the mechanical to electric conversion, it is indeed clear that such conversion is excluded in the characterizing portion.

With respect to the Examiner's comments on top of page 6 of the Office Action, it is submitted that amended claim 9 now excludes that the motor operation is restricted between set limits such as range of motion.

The basis for the subject matter of the newly amended claim 9 is founded in the specification where amended claim 9 is supported in prior claim 9 and in the specification (as found in the originally filed text):

- Technical field of the invention (page 1, lines 5-8):  
“technical field of devices propelled by an electromotive force and particularly in the sector of drive systems for electric trolleys and self-propelled devices.”;
- State of the art prior to the invention (page 1, lines 20-31):  
“This type of device is handled by an operator standing on the floor who controls the direction and, where appropriate, the traveling speed by control means corresponding to the functions mentioned. The control means are usually situated on a lever or bar which, in order to direct the device to the left or to the right, is usually coupled to a frame or platform, having said frame or platform one or more wheels which turn freely and are swivel-coupled to the front or rear part of the body of the device, so that the displacing of the bar or lever to the right or to the left permits the device to be turned to the right or to the left.”
- Object of the invention (page 2, line 32):  
“which can turn in confined spaces”;
- Description of the invention  
(page 4, line 27-page 5, line 2):  
“When the operator wishes to turn to the right, he pushes the handle more firmly in his left hand, so that the control means on the left side order the electric motor on the left to rotate at a greater speed than that on the right and, consequently, the left drive wheel turns more quickly than the

right one and, if it is wished to turn to the left he pushes more firmly in his right hand in which case the control means of the right side and, consequently, the right side electric motor and the right drive wheel work in a way as the described above with respect to the maneuver of turning to the right.”;

(page 5, lines 6-14):


“When the operator wishes to turn the device around, he pushes the handle with the opposite hand to that of the turning direction and simultaneously he pulls the handle with his other hand. In this case, the motor and, consequently, the drive wheel of the side on which the operator pulls the handle rotates backwards whereas the drive wheel on the side on which the operator pushes the handle rotates on the opposite direction, thereby making it possible for the device to turn around completely.”

The new features in combination with the language previously included in the characterizing portion of claim 9 are not taught by Pajerski *et al.*

The combination of Pajerski *et al.* with Hecker *et al.* cannot either comply with the features now included in amended claim 9, because the motor control circuit described in Hecker *et al.* prevents motor operation beyond set limits (range of motion).

Accordingly, it is submitted that the differentiating features mentioned above show that claim 9 of the present application is patentable over Pajerski *et al.* in view of Hecker *et al.* and, as all the remaining claims are dependent thereon, it is submitted that all of the claims in the present application are allowable over the cited references and an allowance of the present application is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
DAVID A. JACKSON  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 26,742

KLAUBER & JACKSON  
411 Hackensack Avenue, 4th Floor  
Hackensack, NJ 07601  
(201) 487-5800